REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are amended and new Claims 7-16 are added by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 and new Claims 7-16 are supported by the original claims, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by the TSG RAN NBAP Specification (3G TS25.433 V1.0.2, 1999 edition, hereinafter "TSG RAN NBAP"). However, Claims 3-6 were objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim, but otherwise were indicated as including allowable subject matter if re-written in independent form.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that Claims 3-6 include allowable subject matter.

Applicants and Applicants' representatives thank Examiner Park and Primary Examiner Hsu for the courtesy of the interview granted to Applicants' representatives on March 1, 2006. During the interview, differences between the claims and TSG RAN NBAP were discussed. Proposed amendments were also presented, which are included herewith. Examiner Park agreed to reconsider the rejections of record after formal submission of the present amendment.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claim 1 is amended to recite "the transport control protocol." Accordingly, Claims 2-6 are in compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by TSG RAN NBAP, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

> forming a request message for establishing the link by concatenating a message of the radio link control protocol and a plurality of connection request messages of the transport control protocol on the link;
> transmitting the request message by the access controller to the base station; and
> receiving the response message sent back by the station,
> wherein the radio link control protocol is the NBAP protocol and the transport control protocol is the ALCAP protocol.

In contrast, TSG RAN NBAP describes a radio link setup message that is used to set up a single link. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this message is not formed by "concatenating a message of the radio link control protocol ***and a plurality of connection request messages*** of the transport control protocol" as recited in amended Claim 1. The outstanding Office Action cited the UL Transport Format Set and the DL transport Format Set described in TSG RAN NBAP as "a plurality of messages of the transport control protocol."[1] However, it is respectfully submitted that TSG RAN NBAP does not teach or suggest that the UL Transport Format Set and the DL transport Format Set are ***separate connection request messages***. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that TSG RAN NBAP does not teach "forming a request message" as recited in amended Claim 1. Consequently, as TSG RAN NBAP does not teach each and every element of Claim 1, Claim 1 (and Claims 2-6 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by TSG RAN NBAP and is patentable thereover.

New Claim 7 is supported by original Claims 1 and 2 and recites in part "forming a request message for establishing the link by concatenating a message of the radio link control protocol, a plurality of messages of the transport control protocol, and a number of the plurality of messages of the transport control protocol."

The outstanding Office Action did not cite any part of the Radio Link Setup message described in TSG RAN NBAP as teaching "a number of the plurality of messages of the

[1]See outstanding Office Action, page 3, lines 2-3.

transport control protocol" as recited in original Claim 2.[2] As noted above, the outstanding Office Action cited the UL Transport Format Set and the DL transport Format Set described in TSG RAN NBAP as "a plurality of messages of the transport control protocol." Thus, to anticipate original Claim 2, the Radio Link Setup message would need to include a field set to "2" to indicate the two Transport Format Sets, assuming *arguendo* that the Transport Format Sets are indeed "a plurality of messages of the transport control protocol." However, it is respectfully submitted that the Radio Link Setup message described by TSG RAN NBAP does not contain any field set to "2," or any field set to a number of connection request messages. Further, as it is respectfully submitted above that TSG RAN NBAP does not teach "a plurality of messages of the transport control protocol," TSG RAN NBAP does not teach "forming a request message" as recited in new Claim 7. Consequently, as TSG RAN NBAP does not teach each and every element of Claim 7, Claim 7 (and Claims 8-11 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by TSG RAN NBAP and is patentable thereover.

New Claim 12 is supported by original Claims 1 and 3. As Claim 3 was indicated as including allowable subject matter, new Claims 12-16 are believed to be patentable.

[2]See outstanding Office Action, page 3, lines 7-9.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Edward Tracy

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Edward Tracy
Registration No. 47,998

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ET\215131US\215131US.AMD5.14.06.DOC